

REMARKS

Claims 35, 38, 40-48, 51, 54 and 56-58 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by United States Patent No. 5,630,116 (“Takaya”). Claims 36, 37, 49, 50, 52 and 53 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Takaya in view of Applicant Admitted Prior Art (“APA”). Claims 39 and 55 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Takaya in view of APA and further in view of United States Patent No. 5,588,147 (“Neeman”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 35, 38, 40-48, 51, 54 and 56-58 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by United States Patent No. 5,630,116 (“Takaya”). Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse.

Independent claims 35, 43 and 51 each recite (1) a master file that is stored at a client; and (2) a replica file that is stored at a server.

Takaya discloses a parent/child computing system in which the parent stores a master file and the client stores a replica of the master file (See Fig. 1). The Office Action alleges that the parent workstation of Takaya is a client, and that the child workstations of Takaya are servers. However, after reviewing Takaya in its entirety, Applicants have found no teaching or suggestion anywhere in Takaya that would support this conclusion. Moreover, Applicants respectfully assert that Takaya suggests the exact opposite. Applicants submit that, if the parent/child computing architecture of Takaya were to include both server and client devices, such an architecture would inherently suggest that the parent device would be a server and that the children of the parent would be clients.

The Office Action seems to assert that the child workstations of Takaya are servers simply because they store slave files. However, simply storing slave files does not in any suggest that a computer is a server. In fact, as noted in the specification of the present application, slave files are typically stored at clients and not at a server. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner cite which portion of Takaya teaches or suggests in any way that the child workstations of Takaya are servers.

DOCKET NO.: 302762.01 / MSFT-2782
Application No.: 10/722,247
Office Action Dated: August 10, 2007

PATENT
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO
37 CFR § 1.116

The Office Action also seems to assert that the parent workstation of Takaya is a client simply because it stores master files. However, simply storing master files does not in any suggest that a computer is a client. In fact, as noted in the specification of the present application, master files are typically stored at a server and not at clients. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner cite which portion of Takaya teaches or suggests in any way that the parent workstation of Takaya is a client.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Takaya does not teach or suggest at least (1) a master file that is stored at a client; and (2) a replica file that is stored at a server, as recited in independent claims 35, 43 and 51. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 35, 43 and 51 and all claims depending therefrom are not anticipated by Takaya. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 102 rejections are respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 36, 37, 49, 50, 52 and 53 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Takaya in view of Applicant Admitted Prior Art (“APA”). Claims 39 and 55 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Takaya in view of APA and further in view of United States Patent No. 5,588,147 (“Neeman”). Applicants respectfully disagree and submit that these claims are patentable at least by reason of their dependency. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejections are respectfully requested.

DOCKET NO.: 302762.01 / MSFT-2782
Application No.: 10/722,247
Office Action Dated: August 10, 2007

PATENT
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO
37 CFR § 1.116

CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application.

Date: October 10, 2007

/Kenneth R. Eiferman/

Kenneth R. Eiferman
Registration No. 51,647

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439